IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Patentee	Ho Keung, TSE.
Patent Number	6665797
Date of Patent	December 16, 2003
Group Art Unit	2132
Examiner	Gilberto Barron Jr.
Postal Address	P.O. Box 54670, North Point Post Office, Hong Kong.
H.K. Tel & FAX	(852) 8105, 1090 (852) 8105, 1091
Email	tse_2004@yahoo.com.hk

Hon. Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks.

Date : Dec 23, 2003

Sir,

Re: Patentee Request for Correction of mistakes in Patent 6665797

Under 35 USC 254

Dear Sir/Madam,

Please correct the following mistakes, incurred through the fault of the Patent and Trademark Office, in my patent 6665797 :

1)   My surname is "Tse", not "Keung", as shown on the front page of the patent.

2)   The title of the Patent "Protection of software again against unauthorized use" is strange and not relevant to the claimed invention, it is not understandable why the Examiner or someone else made this change without informing me. Further, I have submitted a new title "Computer Apparatus/Software Access Right Management" in my communication entitled "Submission of New Claim 21 &

1

FEB 0 2 2004

Amendment on Description", front sheet, third paragraph, filed by fax on Oct, 2001. And it should have been entered.

9)   In my communication entitled "Submission of New Claim 21 & Amendment on Description" filed by fax on Oct, 2001, P.1-3 of the original filed spec is amended by replacement sheets submitted therefor. This amendment should have been entered by the Examiner as he indicated in Office Action dated September 30, 2002, P.2, section 1, that "all amendments submitted from March 6, 2001 to present have been entered". In doing this, the Examiner has overrided a previous decision as readable on the Final Office Action in 2002, P.3, section 7, that "the sole amendment to the specification that has been entered is the addition of the last paragraph on page 11 and requested changes of amendment filed March 3, 2001".

Actually, in my communication entitled "Formal Response to Advisory Action Dated Sept 30 2002", front sheet, first paragraph, line 4, I have requested the Examiner to confirm entry of P.1-3 in "Submission of New Claim 21 & Amendment on Description" by stating that "the amendment on description P.1-3 as well as new title "Computer Apparatus/SoftwareAccess Right Management" as submitted in Amendment entitled "Submission of New Claim 21 & Amendment on Description" filed on Oct, 2, 2001 should have been

2

accepted. Kindly inform me if it is not so". And, as the Examiner indicated nothing contrary to this in his later office actions, so I believed P.1-3 in the amendment entitled "**Submission of New Claim 21 & Amendment on Description**" was entered.

The mistakes have to be corrected, as a reader may have a wrong impression on the patent scope and incorrectly regards it as related to protecting software only. Actually in claim 21, an invention for identity verification is defined.

4)   In the description, P.7, item 4, second paragraph, lines 4-6 that "In the initialization process, the central program sends to the central computer, as mentioned herein above in item 2, an **unencrypted** identity of the rightful user of the central program", the term "**unencrypted**" therein is **a typographical error** and the correct term should be "encrypted".

Evidence can be found in item 2 of the description(P.5), it is disclosed a "Sub-program for providing an Encrypted Identity (EI sub-program)", in which unencrypted identity or its equivalent is not being mentioned.

The replacement paragraph is as follows :

Specifically, when the central program is being installed in a harddisk of a user computer and executed, it will check an encrypted status information stored in itself and from which it knows this is the first time it being executed and will cause an

3

initialization process to take place. In the initialization process, the central program sends to the central computer, as mentioned herein above in item 2, an ~~unencrypted~~ ~~encrypted~~ identity of the rightful user of the central program, then the AC sub-program requests for an encrypted command from the central computer which will provide such an encrypted command, in the manner as described herein above in item 3i, if the rightful user has a valid account which is not closed.

The request for correction of this typographical error was submitted in "Response to Final Action of June 17, 2003", P.4. It should have been entered as the Examiner indicated no objection thereto in his later communications.

Respectfully submitted,

Ho Keung, Tse.

4.